

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

FELICIA RIDGEWAY,)	Case No.: 1:21 CV 2316
)	
Plaintiff)	JUDGE SOLOMON OLIVER, JR.
)	
v.)	
)	
NANCY PELOSI, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	MEMORANDUM OPINION
Defendants)	<u>AND ORDER</u>

I. INTRODUCTION

Pro se plaintiff Felicia Ridgeway filed this action against Nancy Pelosi, “United States District Lawmaker”; President Joseph Biden; Attorney General David Yost; David Brown; “Senator Portman”; and Governor Mike DeWine.

For the reasons that follow, the action is dismissed.

II. BACKGROUND

On December 9, 2021, Plaintiff filed a very brief, one-paragraph complaint consisting of one long incomprehensible sentence. (Doc. No. 1). The complaint is devoid of any facts or decipherable allegations. The civil cover sheet, however, states that the “U.S. District is in violation ... of my and my daughters ... criminal and civil constitution right and we are human beings and victims thats being violated.” (Doc. No. 1-1).

III. DISCUSSION

A. Standard of Review

Pro se pleadings are liberally construed, *Boag v. MacDougall*, 454 U.S. 364, 365, 102 S. Ct. 700, 70 L. Ed. 2d 551 (1982) (per curiam); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520, 92 S. Ct. 594, 30 L. Ed. 2d 652 (1972). The district court, however, is required to dismiss an *in forma pauperis* action under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) if it fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or if it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 328, 109 S. Ct. 1827, 104 L. Ed. 2d 338 (1989); *Lawler v. Marshall*, 898 F.2d 1196 (6th Cir. 1990); *Sistrunk v. City of Strongsville*, 99 F.3d 194, 197 (6th Cir. 1996). A claim lacks an arguable basis in law or fact when it is premised on an indisputably meritless legal theory or when the factual contentions are clearly baseless. *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 327. An action has no arguable factual basis when the allegations are delusional or rise to the level of the irrational or “wholly incredible.” *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 32, 112 S. Ct. 1728, 118 L. Ed. 2d 340 (1992). A cause of action fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted when it lacks “plausibility in the complaint.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 564, 127 S. Ct. 1955, 167 L. Ed. 2d 929 (2007).

A pleading must contain a “short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 677-78, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 173 L. Ed. 2d 868 (2009). The factual allegations in the pleading must be sufficient to raise the right to relief above the speculative level on the assumption that all the allegations in the complaint are true. *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555. The plaintiff is not required to include detailed factual allegations, but he or she must provide more than “an unadorned, the defendant unlawfully harmed me accusation.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678. A pleading that offers legal conclusions or a simple recitation of the elements of a cause of

action will not meet this pleading standard. *Id.* The Court is “not bound to accept as true a legal conclusion couched as a factual allegation.” *Papasan v. Allain*, 478 U.S. 265, 286, 106 S. Ct. 2932, 92 L. Ed. 2d 209 (1986).

In reviewing a complaint, the Court must construe the pleading in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. *Bibbo v. Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc.*, 151 F.3d 559, 561 (6th Cir. 1998).

B. Analysis

Although this Court recognizes that *pro se* pleadings are to be held to a less stringent standard than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers, *Haines*, 404 U.S. at 520-21; *Jourdan v. Jabe*, 951 F.2d 108, 110 (6th Cir.1991), the Court is not required to conjure unpleaded facts or construct claims against defendants on behalf of a *pro se* plaintiff. *See Bassett v. National Collegiate Athletic Ass’n*, 528 F.3d 426, 437 (6th Cir. 2008). The complaint must give the defendants fair notice of what the plaintiff’s claim is and the grounds upon which it rests. *Lillard v. Shelby Cty. Bd. of Edn.*, 76 F.3d 716, 724 (6th Cir.1996) (citation omitted).

Here, Plaintiff’s complaint fails to meet even the most liberal reading of the *Twombly* and *Iqbal* standard as her pleading fails to connect any alleged occurrence to any specific injury, and she fails to identify how any specific defendant harmed her. Indeed, Plaintiff fails to include any factual allegations, she does not assert a discernable claim based on recognized legal authority, and she fails to state a legal cause of action within the jurisdiction of this Court or a proper prayer for relief. This Court and the defendants are left to guess at basic elements of her claim. Plaintiff’s complaint does not satisfy the minimum pleading requirements of Federal Civil Procedure Rule 8 and is therefore dismissed.

IV. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. No. 2) is granted, and this action is dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915(e). Further, the court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ SOLOMON OLIVER, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

January 21, 2022